



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

bottom: Çveta of course is = Pāidva, the white horse of Pedu that kills serpents from the time of the RV. on.—P. 80, l. 10: the practice of slaughtering a cow in honor of a guest (obviously obsolescent in the Gṛhyasūtras) is embalmed in the Vedic proper name Atithigva; see AJP. XVII, pp. 424 ff.—On the same page, middle: To the practices connected with the building of a house add the so-called *çyenayāga* or *çyenejyā*, unearthed by the present writer, JAOS. XVI, pp. 12 ff.—P. 90, middle: for a somewhat more precise explanation of the word *çrāddha* see AJP. XVII 411.—P. 169, middle: see SBE. XLII, pp. 20 ff.

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.

Sophokles Elektra. Erklärt von GEORG KAIBEL. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1896.

The new Teubner *Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Commentare zu griechischen u. römischen Schriftstellern* challenges attention by its title and still more by its programme. No concession is to be made to practical needs. The commentaries are to address themselves to mature scholars, and consequently invite the most rigorous scrutiny. To teach teachers is a perilous task, and the publishers have made a wise selection in the editor of the first commentary, and the editor a wise selection in the choice of his text. Apart from his long and close association with Wilamowitz, KAIBEL's independent work would lead us to expect a penetrating treatment of his author, and the Elektra of Sophokles is just the play to bring out the value of the principles that KAIBEL advocates. By a rare kindness of fortune we are able to compare the dramatic methods of the three great coryphaei of Attic tragedy in handling the same theme, and interpretation necessarily plays a conspicuous part in the Elektra. True, textual criticism will never cease from troubling, but exegesis must come to the front when so many problems of tragic psychology are involved as one finds in this play of Sophokles. "Exhaust interpretation before you attack the text" is a wise rule of a great teacher, but, unfortunately, the interpreter too often becomes exhausted before the interpretation and conjectural criticism is summoned to the relief. To be sure, what is sometimes called conjecture is not, properly speaking, conjecture. It is a manner of proof-reading for which modern slaves of the vernacular press take no credit to themselves, as every man that has served in the humble capacity of reader makes daily 'emendations' that would be the fortune of some scholars, if the operations were performed on the body of the classic texts. It is purely a matter of familiarity with the range of thought and expression, and is less a wonder, the more one is at home in a given language. Indeed, it is very questionable whether Hellenists of the old time plumed themselves so much on their corrections as do men of our day, and the praises that have been showered on some of Reiske's work in that line would doubtless have astonished that large-limbed scholar himself. But a homily on the abuses of conjectural criticism would be sadly out of place in a review of KAIBEL's Elektra, for in the very first lines of his prelimi-

nary observations he gives us to understand that he does not favor a ready resort to conjecture. 'Emendation,' he says, 'is a rare flower, which grows, if anywhere, on the rock of interpretation, and the longer one pursues this flower, the better does he know how hard it is to find or to pluck.' The application of this remark to the text of Sophokles is near at hand, and KAIBEL's protest against 'the flood of conjectures by which the text of Sophokles has been marred' will be more readily echoed to-day than it would have been twenty or thirty years ago. Especially to be taken to heart are KAIBEL's words about the patching of texts by parallel passages, a kind of skin-grafting to which critics are prone; and he is very emphatic, as emphatic as was the late Mr. Matthew Arnold, on the rights of poetic individuality. 'Every great poet,' he says, 'himself creates his language and his art. Developed with him, they grow with him, and die with him as his *δαίμων*. He has not inherited them and cannot transmit them.' And yet these words must be taken with some reserves. In Greek the type of each form of art, of each sphere of language, is more potent than is commonly supposed, more potent against other forms of arts, other spheres of language, than any amount of individual sympathy. The lyric poet is nearer to the lyric poet, no matter how diverse his temperament, than he is to the tragic poet of kindred genius. Self-ravelling is the best material for darning the poet's text, just as a poet is always his own best interpreter, but in default of that one may well resort to rival looms.

After KAIBEL's frank statement of his attitude towards conjectural criticism, the student of this edition of Sophokles' *Elektra* will not expect to encounter a host of irritating and inconclusive conjectures, and at least one old fellow-student of Vahlen's has read with a certain satisfaction the tribute that KAIBEL has paid to the sound methods of that eminent scholar, by whose example conservative souls have been strengthened in their adherence to the precept of the great master already cited.

I have given at some length this confession of faith because KAIBEL's *Elektra* is the initial volume of a series that seems destined to have a decided influence on the editorial work of classical scholars. At first, as I have intimated, the veteran student may not be willing to grant that so much remains to be done for the interpretation of Sophokles, may resent the assumption of superior insight into the meaning of a poet who has claimed the study of so many gifted scholars; but there is, after all, no arrogance in KAIBEL's claims, as there is no arrogance in any form of devotion. The secret that is revealed to kindred genius at a glance may be won by lesser spirits through steadfast and loving contemplation. That a new *Elektra* has emerged from this study of KAIBEL's would be saying too much, but passage after passage, scene after scene, has received welcome light and fresh color.

It is to be regretted that KAIBEL has not followed Wilamowitz in accompanying his edition with a translation. A translation is often the best commentary, and this KAIBEL recognizes. If Christ had given us a Latin rendering of Pindar, we should not be in doubt as to his judgment on moot-points without number. But KAIBEL evidently subscribes to Wilam-

owitz's doctrine that a poet must be translated into poetry, and for this he professes not to have the necessary gift, and Jebb's illustrious example has not induced him to attempt a prose version.

The editor's judgment as to the MS basis of the text may be given in a few words. A theoretical Λ and a theoretical Π are the ultimate sources of L and P. L^1 presents a very faulty text, corrected by L^2 after a member of the P family. Whoso admits the indispensableness of the corrections of L^2 admits the value of Π and the consequent value of P. No new collation has been found necessary, and KAIBEL does not attach any countervailing importance to the facsimile.

The Introduction is largely taken up with an analysis of the drama and a suggestive comparison of the Elektra of Sophokles and the Elektra of Euripides, in which the idealism of the elder poet is not extolled at the expense of the naturalism of the younger. 'Euripides,' says KAIBEL in substance, 'has shown wonderful power of invention in creating a heroine of which no representative of the modern school, of the "experimental romance," need be ashamed.' He had no 'documents'; he was hampered by a mass of traditions, which had to be respected and yet so reinterpreted and so readapted as to explain out of the environment the character of the heroine, which he conceived and created in his own way. The thought of evolving Elektra as a necessary product of her *milieu* was not his. It was due to Sophokles. But Euripides felt that Sophokles had not made the most of it, that the fruitful idea had not been made to yield all its dramatic possibilities, and the Euripidean Elektra was the result—not separated far in time from that of Sophokles.

This, it will be observed, is a very different tone from that of the traditional criticism of the Euripidean Elektra. The 'dramatic possibilities' of the life of an old maid in Greek antiquity cannot be measured by modern standards. Nay, unless the process of transformation is arrested, fifty years hence Americans will need a learned apparatus in order to understand the old maid of the nineteenth century, and perhaps even Frenchmen will be at a loss to comprehend the *vieille fille* of Balzac.

As has been intimated, the commentary shows on almost every page the value of fresh, independent study, but the character of the work precludes the production of specimens. More open to comment are the grammatical notes. Indeed, the admissibility of grammatical notes in an edition of so high a reach as this will be questioned by some. Assuredly, trivial matters ought not to be treated, but what is trivial, what not, is always doubtful. However, the points that are taken up are usually despatched in a few words with Wilamowitzian resoluteness. And yet the conclusion reached is not always self-evident. For instance, some note on *φέρωμεν* (v. 58) seems to be necessary. Yet the explanation given, which is credited to Vahlen, is not satisfactory. To say that the optative makes the action designed depend on circumstances is too vague. The irregular sequence might be explained by the intrusion of the wish, but a more simple explanation is at hand. *κέρυμμένον* involves an action prior to that of the leading verb, so it is at once a perfect and a pluperfect, and these intercalated

clauses are responsible for many such shifts. λαβεῖν τε καὶ τητᾶσθαι (v. 274) is not happily interpreted by λαβεῖν τε καὶ μὴ λαβεῖν. Like all verbs of privation, τητᾶσθαι is much more than μὴ λαβεῖν (see on Pind. Pyth. 6, 22), and there is bitter emphasis in the article λαβεῖν θ' ὁμοίως καὶ τὸ τητᾶσθαι, the same bitter emphasis that KAIBEL himself recognizes in the article elsewhere, v. 166: τὸν ἀνήντων | οἶτον ἔχουσα κακῶν. On v. 318: τοῦ κασιγνήτου τί φής, ἡξοντος ἢ μέλλοντος, K. explains the genitive as a partitive. 'Nicht das ganze Wesen oder Handeln des Bruders kommt in Betracht, sondern nur ein Theil.' τοῦ κασιγνήτου is equivalent to τὸ τοῦ κ., and if any one chooses to call that a partitive, he is welcome. But a parallel with πειεῖν τοῦ οἴνου does not commend itself, and τὸ τῶνδ' εἰνουν πάρα (v. 1203) is possessive rather than partitive, as is shown by parallels with the possessive pronoun. On v. 590: ἐκβαλοῦσ' ἔχεις, KAIBEL decides the moot-point as to the transitivity or intransitivity of ἔχω with a positiveness hardly justified by recent surveys of the history of this construction. 'Ueberall kann und muss ἔχω intransitiv "sich verhalten" sein.' The quarrel is one between historical growth, which favors the transitive view, and logical consistency, which favors the intransitive view, and is not to be settled by a ukase. These are a few of the various grammatical points in which agreement with KAIBEL is not inevitable; nor am I inclined to subscribe to the sweeping sentence (p. 90) that the ethical character of Greek metres cannot be determined by universal rules, that it depends on poetical handling, and especially on the environment. This is what Wilamowitz maintains for Glyconic verses, and the flutter of the Glyconic metres may, indeed, serve to express a variety of emotions, but there are certain logaedic measures—notably those in which syncopé abounds—which have a more uniform tone, and KAIBEL is somewhat inconsistent with himself when he remarks on v. 171 = 192 that the bitter blame at the close is well marked by the strongly syncopated iambic verses. There is no reason to me discernible why similar checks to movement should not produce the same results in logaedic measures.

B. L. GILDERSLEEVE.